DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 469 506 JC 020 686

TITLE	Faculty as Professionals: Responsibilities, Standards and Ethics.
INSTITUTION	Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, Sacramento.
PUB DATE	2002-00-00
NOTE	38p.; "Adopted Spring 2002."
AVAILABLE FROM	For full text: http://www.academicsenate.cc.ca.us/Publications/Rec.htm.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Behavior Standards; *College Faculty; *Community Colleges; *Ethics; Governance; Standards; *Teacher Role; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*Academic Senate for California Community Colleges; American Association of University Professors

ABSTRACT

This paper addresses the issue of faculty ethics and begins with a summary of ethical principles previously adopted by the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. The 12 faculty responsibilities outlined in this statement relate to: (1) discipline; (2) students; (3) colleagues; (4) academic institution; (5) community; (6) development of one's own and other's scholarly competence; (7) honest academic conduct; (8) cultural and gender sensitivity; (9) encouragement of the pursuit of learning; (10) learning environments of trust and sensitivity; (11) academic standards; and (12) academic freedom. The paper introduces several strategies used in the field to address perceived transgressions of professional codes of ethical conduct. Examples include a professional relations committee, local senate policy, or a professional ethics and standards committee. The results of a local senate turnaround survey on current practices regarding professional standards are also presented. The paper concludes with the recommendation that, at the very least, local academic senates should consider officially adopting the extended American Association of University Professors (AAUP) statement of ethics. Appended are the survey of campus professional relations procedures and two Academic Senate for California Community College position papers on faculty ethics. (Contains 15 references.) (RC)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

Adopted Spring 2002

ED 469 506

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P. M. Silverman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FACULTY AS PROFESSIONALS: RESPONSIBILITIES, STANDARDS AND ETHICS

THE ACADEMIC SENATE FOR CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Adopted Spring 2002

FACULTY AS PROFESSIONALS: RESPONSIBILITIES, STANDARDS AND ETHICS

THE ACADEMIC SENATE FOR CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Educational Policies Committee 2001-2002

Linda Collins, Los Medanos College, Chair

Lacy Barnes-Mileham, Reedley College

Bernie Seyboldt Day, Ohlone/Foothill College

Bruce Koller, Diablo Valley College

Chris Storer, De Anza College

Rosa Carlson, College of the Sequoias, CIO Representative

Jeff Cooper, Shasta College, CIO Representative

Educational Policies Committee 2000-2001

Kate Clark, Irvine Valley College, Chair

Lacy Barnes-Mileham, Reedley College

Elton Hall, Moorpark College

Hoke Simpson, Grossmont College

Ian Walton, Mission College

Susan Carleo, Los Angeles Valley College, CIO Representative

Educational Policies Committee 1999-2000

Hoke Simpson, Grossmont College, Chair

Lacy Barnes-Mileham, Reedley College

Kate Clark, Irvine Valley College

Elton Hall, Moorpark College

Mary Rider, Grossmont College

Ian Walton, Mission College

Susan Carleo, Los Angeles Valley College, CIO Representative

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract 1

History and Introduction 2

Revisiting the Extended AAUP statement 4

Responsibility to Discipline 5

Responsibility to Students 5

Responsibility to Colleagues 5

Responsibility to Academic Institution 5

Responsibility to the Community 6

Responsibility to the Development of One's Own and Others' Scholarly Competence 6

Responsibility for Honest Academic Conduct 6

Responsibility Toward Cultural and Gender Sensitivity 6

Responsibility to Encourage the Pursuit of Learning 7

Responsibility for Learning Environments of Trust and Sensitivity 7

Responsibility for Academic Standards 7

Responsibility to Maintain Academic Freedom 7

Current Status in the Field 8

Survey Results 8

Implications for Future Practice 9

Some Caveats and Considerations Regarding the Adoption of an Accountability Mechanism 10

Use of Already Established Mechanisms 10

Potential Drawbacks 11

Use as a Deterrent 11

Institutional Climate 12

Strategies Utilized in the Field 13

Strategy #1: A Professional Relations Committee (PRC) 14

Strategy #2: Local Senate or Local District Policy: Complaint Resolution Procedures 15

Strategy #3: Professional Ethics and Standards Committee 16

Institutional Climate: The AAUP Procedures for Censure for Substantial Noncompliance with the Principles of Shared Governance 17

Summary Comments on Selected Strategies 17

Recommendations to Local Senates 18

Bibliography 19

Appendix A. Survey: Campus Professional Relations Procedures 22

Appendix B. Ethics: Why the Academic Senate has Adopted the AAUP Ethics Statement 24

Appendix C. Faculty Ethics: Expanding The AAUP Ethics Statement 27

ABSTRACT

This paper revisits the issue of faculty ethics, beginning with a statement of the principles previously adopted by the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, and reaffirming that previous commitment. In recognition of the Academic Senate's responsibility to assist local senates grappling with such a complex set of issues, this paper highlights several strategies used in the field to address perceived transgressions of professional codes of ethical conduct. These strategies are offered as samples to assist local senates seeking to formulate, draft, and implement a code of professional and ethical conduct. Cautions as to the potential drawbacks to this approach are also noted. The Academic Senate does not endorse a particular model, but aims to provide helpful illustrations that may serve as guidelines or starting points for local discussions. This paper also presents local senates turnaround survey results of on current practices regarding professional standards. The paper concludes by recommending that, at the very least, local academic senates should consider officially adopting the extended American Association of University Professors (AAUP) statement of ethics as their local position.

HISTORY AND INTRODUCTION

From its inception, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has valued such ideals as equity, inclusion, openness, diversity, accountability, integrity and honor to help define a professional ethos. The teaching and modeling of such ideals is central to our educational mission: "...the essence of a college should lie in something other than [just] its purposes...its essence should be a matter of its and its society's moral practices [as well]" (Allen, 1997; p. 134). The underlying principles inherent in moral standards only have merit when they are taught and promoted. An institution should seek those willing to model, "the values, rights, duties, and virtues that pertain to people as moral beings..." (Heslep, 1995; p. 2).

Upholding these values and ethical and professional standards are of profound importance, and faculty have the opportunity and obligation to model these standards in their educational communities. It is essential not just to faculty, but also to the general public, that there be continued vigilance to ensure the enrichment and education of the individual in a democratic and open society. Nurturing ethical development and providing the tools for ethical reasoning is a core educational function.

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges clearly regards the issue of professional standards as very important. To affirm this strong belief the Academic Senate officially adopted, in 1988, the American Association of University Professors' (AAUP's) "Statement of Professional Ethics." The AAUP Statement affirms five areas of faculty responsibility—our disciplines, students, colleagues, institutions and communities.[1]

[1] *See the Academic Senate paper entitled "Ethics: Why the Academic Senate has Adopted the AAUP Ethics Statement," April 1988.*

To further this commitment, in 1994, the Academic Senate adopted a paper entitled *Faculty Ethics: Expanding The AAUP Ethics Statement* to address issues faced specifically by community college faculty in California. That paper elaborates principles of scholarly competence, honest academic conduct of students, academic standards, cultural and gender sensitivity, the free pursuit of learning, avoiding exploitation of students, academic freedom, and contributions to the profession.[2]

At the 1998 Fall Plenary Session, the following adopted resolution directed the Executive Committee to address the issue of ethics again by providing additional assistance to local academic senates seeking to develop processes to implement and/or enforce statements of ethical and professional principles. Resolution 19.08 reads:

> *Whereas the Academic Senate in 1994 received an ethics policy in the paper entitled "Faculty Ethics: Expanding the AAUP Ethics Statement," and*
>
> *Whereas this policy was meant to guide the community college faculty in the performance of their duties and their interactions with colleagues, staff, and students, and*
>
> *Whereas the distribution and the implementation of this policy are important for maintaining professional relations and a good academic climate on campus,*
>
> *Therefore be it resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges direct the Executive Committee to develop a model for an ethics and professional standards process and committee structure to recommend to local academic senates to help them implement the Academic Senates paper "Faculty Ethics: Expanding the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Ethics Statement."*

In response to this resolution, the Educational Policies Committee offered a breakout session in Spring 2000 and conducted a survey about existing practices on campuses. Explicit discussions and concerns raised during the breakout session as well as results from the survey revealed that while college faculty have experienced instances of perceived breaches of professional ethics, few have an established institutional or systematic response to them. Additionally, many faculty would welcome continued discourse regarding this issue as a means by which to keep this discussion in the forefront of faculty minds as we serve our disciplines, students, colleagues, institutions, and communities.

A review of the extended AAUP statement will provide an essential context for this paper; along with this review, examples of current practices in the field will be provided. These exemplify means by which local senates are working to assist their faculty in maintaining a principled community and common ethos. The paper will offer several general approaches that local senates have used to develop or revise their campus' guidelines for ethical behavior. Some cautions and caveats will also be noted. Finally, results from the survey will be reported, followed by conclusions and recommendations to the field.

---

[2] *The two Senate papers noted here are located on the Academic Senate website at http://www.academicsenate.cc.ca.us and in Appendices B & C*

REVISITING THE EXTENDED AAUP STATEMENT

The Academic Senate's 1988 adoption of the AAUP ethics statement demonstrates its commitment to a code of moral values that maintains the excellence of the profession. The Academic Senate adopted the AAUP document because it was written from a positive perspective, and presented a code of moral values by which faculty could assess their professional conduct. The AAUP statement of ethics outlines five areas of faculty responsibility including: 1) to their disciplines; 2) to their students; 3) to their colleagues; 4) to their institutions; and 5) to their communities. As noted earlier, the Academic Senate subsequently extended these principles to include seven additional areas of responsibility: 6) scholarly competence; 7) honest academic conduct; 8) cultural and gender sensitivity; 9) free pursuit of learning; 10) a trusting and sensitive learning environment; 11) academic standards; and 12) academic freedom.

The Academic Senate recommends that community college faculty utilize these principles when making determinations about ethical behavior, and perceived deviations from such behavior. Further, these principles can provide the basis for a process designed by the local academic senate to respond to concerns of affected faculty. Perhaps more importantly, these principles can be used to nurture an institutional culture that provides an atmosphere of comfort and safety whereby learners can flourish. Each of the twelve principles is briefly summarized below, particularly as they apply to community college faculty. (For a more complete treatment, see the previously adopted Academic Senate papers. Note that the first five principles below are paraphrased, or quoted directly from the AAUP Statement of Professional Ethics; the additional seven responsibilities are paraphrased, or quoted directly from the 1994 Academic Senate paper which is attached in Appendix C).

RESPONSIBILITY TO DISCIPLINE

As our disciplines initially attracted us by feeding our intellectual curiosity and quenching our thirst for knowledge through education, we should seek to sustain this enthusiasm by keeping current in our fields, attending conferences, continuing our affiliation with professional organizations, taking courses, and by using staff development, sabbatical leaves, exchange programs and similar means continuously to develop our expertise and teaching methods.

Devoting "energies to developing and improving scholarly competence" is a means by which faculty can successfully shoulder this responsibility and model behavior consistent with the standards of the educational community (Statement of Professional Ethics, 1987). To this end, faculty should utilize developmental opportunities to grow and seek to maintain professional standards through tenure review and peer evaluation processes.[3] Exercising self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge is strengthened by such continual growth.

RESPONSIBILITY TO STUDENTS

We have obligations to students not only in class, but also outside the classroom. As faculty, we encourage students to make use of our office hours, to become full participants in the college community, and to partake of the broad range of extracurricular activities available to them. Further, we continually seek to ensure that students have adequate support services such as testing, counseling, placement, learning resources, career and transfer information. We do much to instill their interest in life-long learning if we spark their intellectual curiosity and critical thinking, foster their leadership and citizenship by serving as their club advisors, and protect their academic experience by ensuring academic honesty in the classroom.

RESPONSIBILITY TO COLLEAGUES

Faculty members "have obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars" (Statement of Professional Ethics, 1987). It is of utmost importance that we actively involve ourselves in the hiring process of new faculty and fulfill our responsibilities toward meaningful evaluation, retention, mentoring, and promotion of all new faculty members (including part time, contract and other). Serving on committees that recommend policies and make decisions relating to students, courses, and professional leaves are also obligations faculty accept.

Helping others in difficult times and broadening successes by sharing information, mentoring, offering dispassionate advice, and team-teaching are all services that can be offered to ensure professionalism toward colleagues and, perhaps more importantly, can help foster and model the professional and ethical ideals that collectively guide institutional behavior.[4]

RESPONSIBILITY TO ACADEMIC INSTITUTION

Contractual obligations require faculty to meet classes, keep office hours, and perhaps to serve on committees. These are clearly ethical as well as contractual obligations. Less obvious is the responsibility to exercise due diligence in monitoring the integrity of the institution as it applies to the conditions of their workplace; faculty have an

[3] *For a complete review of the importance of faculty development, see the Academic Senate paper entitled "Faculty Development: A Senate Issue," April 2000.*

[4] *For a complete review of the importance of faculty development, see the Academic Senate paper entitled "Guidelines for Developing a Faculty Evaluation Process," Spring 1990.*

ongoing right and responsibility to critique their institution in order to improve it. Conversely, faculty must consider the operation of the college as a whole and contribute positively to the academic climate of the institution.

Because ethical and professional integrity is often guided only through unwritten social contracts within an institution, responsibilities toward creating a safe, trusting, nonhostile and open learning environment are paramount.[5]

RESPONSIBILITY TO THE COMMUNITY

When faculty serve the community by participating in speakers' bureaus or college-sponsored activities, they simultaneously serve the institution and are usually explicitly associated with it. More subtly, faculty serve as models to both students and community by voting in public elections, by participating in political activities, by obeying the laws or engaging in civil resistance, by working for and contributing to charitable events, or by serving in secular and religious institutions that reflect personal beliefs. These activities require faculty to resist using positions or classrooms as bully pulpits and to exercise judgment in making clear to others when—or if—they represent the institution.

Once again, utilizing developmental opportunities to nurture and maintain established standards within the educational community through tenure review, peer evaluation and mentoring processes will help ensure and strengthen self-discipline, judgment and the practice of ethical behavior.[6]

RESPONSIBILITY TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF ONE'S OWN AND OTHERS' SCHOLARLY COMPETENCE

Faculty develop the critical thinking skills of those in our academic community when they honor dissent predicated on rational thought. There is a difference between being an authority in one's discipline and adopting an authoritarian pedagogical style. Authority in one's discipline is achieved through careful inquiry and critical reflection, activities that are suppressed by an authoritarian pedagogy. A key responsibility for faculty is "modeling and teaching critical thinking and attempting to instill in students the intellectual virtues that foster this critical thought." (Academic Senate, 1994) Faculty should be encouraged to teach and lead by example.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR HONEST ACADEMIC CONDUCT

While student handbooks, catalogues and other college publications may explicate existing rules and regulations governing both academic and social behavior on campus, faculty reinforce respect for these policies by ensuring that students observe them in their presence. For example, by repeating or elaborating on practices of academic honesty (or dishonesty) in our syllabi and handouts, we can promulgate appropriate scholarly behavior. Faculty who model and teach the means by which students can avoid academic dishonesty, nurture the overall integrity of the learning community in which both groups work.

RESPONSIBILITY TOWARD CULTURAL AND GENDER SENSITIVITY

"Respecting students as individuals is an ethical imperative." (Academic Senate, 1994) Mere tolerance, simply putting up with or enduring, is inadequate. Responsibilities to cultural and gender sensitivity should go beyond tolerance and deference. We should couple this respect for

---

[5] *See Academic Senate paper entitled "Toward a Nonviolent Campus Climate Conflict Resolution to assist in fostering a positive academic climate," Spring 1996.*

[6] *For a complete discussion of the importance of faculty evaluation through the use of collaboration, mentoring, etc. see the Academic Senate paper entitled "Accreditation: Evaluating the Collective Faculty," Spring 1990.*

students with the recognition of difference and the appreciation of similarity embodied within a robust concept of tolerance. Faculty should not only teach about such sensitivities, they should model them as well.[7]

RESPONSIBILITY TO ENCOURAGE THE PURSUIT OF LEARNING

"The idea of open access is the quintessential expression of democracy in education." (Academic Senate, 1994) Responsibility to the pursuit of learning includes our commitment to a postsecondary education for every California citizen as defined by the California Community Colleges' 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education.[8] Vigilance in resistance and opposition to any recommendations that would diminish students' educational options is clearly a faculty responsibility. Addressing barriers to educational access and student success is crucial, especially for historically underrepresented students.[9]

RESPONSIBILITY FOR LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS OF TRUST AND SENSITIVITY

The learning experience is best when trust exists between faculty member and student. "Faculty must be cognizant of the possible perceptions... students may [form] in response to faculty-student interactions;" faculty should align their actions with the fundamental tenet that "individuals in power and authority should not use their advantaged position for their own gain or self-interest" (Academic Senate, 1994). Students should be assured that their learning occurs within environments that privilege probity.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR ACADEMIC STANDARDS

The dual mission of the community college is to prepare students for success in both careers and participatory citizenship. Lowering standards to pass students along undermines their abilities to meet future challenges. Maintaining sound and fair standards while helping students to understand those standards together provide a realistic view of what can be expected in other educational institutions and in the larger society beyond the college campus.[10]

RESPONSIBILITY TO MAINTAIN ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Being a faculty member means being a colleague in a profession where freedom of expression ensures the open exchange of ideas.[11] Whereas in the classroom opinions do not all have equal weight, all views are encouraged. As part of faculty obligation to infuse the skills of critical thinking, faculty seek to create classroom environments that foster the free exchange of ideas.

---

[7] *For a thought provoking discussion on cultural diversity, please access "The Challenge of Cultural Diversity in California Community Colleges" by Karen Sue Grosz on the Senate website at http://www.academicsenate.cc.ca.us.*

[8] *This central tenet has been attacked in the 1994 review, "Master Plan in Focus," and the report of the Little Hoover Commission, "Open Doors, Open Minds," both of which proposed to penalize students who dropped classes or deviated from their educational plans.*

[9] *See Academic Senate paper entitled "Student Equity: Proposal for Action," Fall 1991.*

[10] *See Academic Senate paper entitled "Professional Standards for Faculty for a full discussion on professional standards for faculty," Spring 1987.*

[11] *Also see Academic Senate paper entitled "Academic Freedom and Tenure: A Faculty Perspective for a discussion of academic freedom," Spring 1998.*

CURRENT STATUS IN THE FIELD

SURVEY RESULTS[12]

A turnaround survey administered during the Fall 2000 Plenary Session yielded thirty-one responses, and suggested that only fifteen of the responding academic senates had officially adopted a statement regarding ethics, code of conduct, or standards of professional behavior; the remainder of the respondents were either not certain as to whether their institution had any statement of professional standards to which they adhered or were certain that their institution had not. Eight respondents, or 25%, reported that their colleges have procedures in place to address perceived breaches of ethical behavior regarding faculty-to-faculty conflicts. Nine respondents indicated that their senates had indeed followed the lead of the Academic Senate by adopting the statement of the AAUP. Only two colleges responding to the survey indicated they have adopted the expanded Academic Senate statement published in 1994. One college indicated that it had adopted a hybrid of the two.

Just over half of the respondents indicated that their institutions had policies and procedures for sexual harassment in place or written policies and procedures for student conduct and violations thereof. Ten respondents, however, indicated that such policies and procedures were equally codified for staff, faculty, and administrators.

[12] *See Appendix A for the complete text of the survey*

Additional results from the survey indicated that thirteen of the local senates that responded had not considered this a topic for discussion on their campuses. Where this has been a topic of discussion at the local senate level, ten respondents indicated that they believed this either to be a contractual matter or a matter with very little need for such policy and procedure. While five of the respondents indicated that their senates could not agree on a mechanism, eight considered it unlikely that such an enforcement mechanism could produce the desired results.

IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE PRACTICE

Results of the survey and breakout discussions suggest that while adoption of an ethics statement (regardless of whether it is from AAUP or locally derived) helps focus and clarify matters of ethical concern for faculty, implementation and enforcement of such statements are quite another matter. As shown, very few academic senates have established policies and procedures for adjudication of ethical conflicts or concerns, this perhaps as a result of recognizing the many potential drawbacks to such a mechanism. Although the subjectivity of ethics codes can be problematic, concerned faculty often feel the need for such codified direction. While it should be recognized that many perceived breaches of professional standards can be dealt with through already established shared governance policies or processes, it is further recognized that perceived breaches of ethical issues may need alternative procedures or mechanisms to obtain resolution.

Although the Academic Senate has endorsed and expanded upon the AAUP statement of ethical principles, it has not taken a position either for or against any particular accountability mechanism. Nevertheless, the Academic Senate offers herein several strategies currently being used in the field to confront unethical or unprofessional faculty behavior in order to assist the field with such difficulties. All strategies have reportedly yielded successful results for the institutions using them; they can and should be modified in ways to render them appropriate to the particular institution adopting or considering adopting them. Prior to the presentation of these strategies, it is important to further consider the context and possible drawbacks of such strategies.

SOME CAVEATS AND CONSIDERATIONS REGARDING THE ADOPTION OF AN ACCOUNTABILITY MECHANISM

USE OF ALREADY ESTABLISHED MECHANISMS

It is important to restate that many professional issues are really matters that could, and possibly should be, better dealt with through other processes already in place; that is, through established processes for peer evaluation and tenure review. In other papers, the Academic Senate has clearly articulated this position, and the importance of thorough and honest peer evaluation.[13]

At any given college, much that is related to professional obligations for faculty may be addressed by contract and by accompanying board policies or grievance processes. Given the wide variation in local contracts, however, it is difficult to make general statements in this regard. Local senates developing implementation policies or processes are advised to work closely with their local collective bargaining agents to ensure clarity, avoid legal complications, and prevent inappropriate encroachment on matters within the scope of collective bargaining. It should be noted, however, that while most contracts address matters of dispute or complaint between faculty and administrators, by definition such contracts do not regulate faculty-to-faculty conflicts. It is this latter arena that is the primary focus herein of most ethical or professional procedures. It should be further noted that many of these faculty-to-faculty issues that surface in colleges really are about interpersonal conflicts rather than actual violations or transgressions of professional ethics. As such, they could be addressed by informal or formal conflict resolution methods.

[13] *See Academic Senate papers entitled "Tenure: Towards a Model Four-Year Tenure Process," Fall 1990, and "Academic Freedom and Tenure: A Faculty Perspective," Spring 1998.*

POTENTIAL DRAWBACKS

Local senates contemplating strategies to deal with perceived breaches of ethical responsibility should be cognizant of the inherent drawbacks of such mechanisms. Care must be taken to prevent such strategies from undermining the very commitments they ostensibly are devised to secure. While such a policy can often serve as welcome directive in navigating ethical seas, the same policy can quite possibly, among other things, be used as ammunition against faculty within the evaluation process, as a tool of retribution in dealing with personal grudges or vendettas, or as a means of scapegoating individuals. Tenured faculty should recognize as well the relatively greater vulnerability of their nontenured colleagues to such abuses; particular care should be taken to ensure protection of noncontract and part-time faculty from possible misuse of these approaches.

By its very nature, any process or procedure to address the unethical actions of faculty can run the danger of encroaching on rights to fair treatment and other components of due process. The legal problems that could accompany such processes need careful consideration to ensure that components of due process not be undermined by groups or committees who make determinations of violation of member rights, as well as of generally understood academic norms. Here again, members of such groups or committees should work closely with their respective bargaining units to clarify any questions of legality, especially when the violation in question may lead to district or administrative charges against the faculty member. The local academic senate and the bargaining agent also might consider whether to put the agreed-upon process into the collective bargaining agreement.

Perhaps a more damaging result of using such strategies is the potential inadvertent creation of institutional climates that impinge upon the academic freedom of individual faculty members, and on the rights of students to learn in a nonhostile environment. If the climate created has a chilling effect upon the expression of ideas and upon the expression of diverse and critical viewpoints, then it is antithetical to the collective educational enterprise. In implementing any mechanism to respond to perceived breaches of ethical behavior, faculty must work to ensure that the full range of voices and perspectives flourishes within the educational community, and that our students are educated in a context that models the creative tension of often-conflicting points of view. In practice, attempts to enforce adopted principles or group norms are often fraught with tendencies toward moralistic judgment or overzealous application. Clearly, faculty must distinguish between repressive or onerous expectations of conformity and principled, responsible professional climates.

USE AS A DETERRENT

Conceivably, the mere existence of mechanisms to address breaches of professional or ethical conduct can serve a formative function. In the survey, some respondents noted that they had mechanisms in place but had not used them; the respondents believed that the mechanisms served as deterrents to unprofessional conduct. Whether or not the local academic senate ultimately adopts them, consideration of such implementation mechanisms can become the occasion for a more thorough discussion of these issues on campus. And quite possibly, the discussion itself can serve as an important vehicle for collective professional reflection among the faculty.

In fact, periodic discussion of these matters, particularly if a thoughtful and deliberate part of an ongoing professional development program, can be an important component in creating responsible institutional climates that spur faculty to be their professional best. Local senates can work to foster positive ethical climates by creating or supporting

professional development activities that give faculty opportunities to explore and to discuss ethical dilemmas. For example, staff development or flex activities can serve as opportunities to have mediated discussions exploring these issues and can serve as awareness training to help foster positive and principled institutional climates. Ultimately, local senates also foster ethical communities of practice through fair and effective hiring practices, strong and well implemented peer evaluation and tenure procedures, mentoring programs, and structures designed to support effective teaching and counseling.

INSTITUTIONAL CLIMATE

Finally, it is important to note that procedures addressing professional ethics tend to focus on perceived transgressions by individual faculty members. However, colleges differ in the nature and health of their overall institutional climates. In colleges where the climate is repressive, or where unethical behaviors have been historically and consistently rewarded, policies focused on the behavior of individual faculty members will not be sufficient. In such climates, existing structures and systemic pressures can undermine the exercise of professional judgment, integrity and excellence. Such hostile and difficult institutional climates undermine the ability to foster healthy educational contexts for our students. Under such conditions, faculty, administrators and staff alike often retreat from the collective community. But as noted in the AAUP statement, faculty members have a special responsibility to enjoin the criticism of institutional arrangements that undermine the exercise of collective ethical commitments and professional responsibility. Local senates in particular bear the weight, and often the brunt, of the responsibility to name and correct such institutional ills.

In such instances, it is unlikely that policies and procedures based on addressing the behavior of individual faculty members can address such fundamental institutional problems. And it may be that such climates are much more likely to foster the abuse of policies of any kind. These situations may necessitate other means by which to deal with such collective problems (refer to the later section on Institutional Climate and the AAUP Procedures on page 17).

STRATEGIES UTILIZED IN THE FIELD

In the 2001-2002 academic year, the Educational Policies Committee worked with the Chief Instructional Officers to canvas local colleges for relevant policies and implementation mechanisms.[14] From these efforts the Committee distilled the types of approaches, and their essential components, currently in use in the field. The Committee identified essentially three strategies. Their inclusion here should not be taken as prescriptive or evaluative; rather these are presented as snapshots of current practice. It should also be noted that these strategies represent variants on a theme rather than strictly discrete approaches.

Local senates considering the adoption of some code of ethics or professional standards would likely modify these illustrative examples to render them appropriate to their particular institutional climate. Given the cautions and caveats related to such a mechanism already outlined, it seems prudent to initiate these discussions in the local senate prior to the emergence of problem behavior or perceived ethical violations and to reach consensus on both the policies and procedures for ensuring ethical and professional behavior.

[14] *The colleges whose policies were reviewed are: Antelope Valley College, College of the Sequoias, Diablo Valley College, Grossmont College, Lassen Community College, Merritt College, Modesto Junior College, Moorpark College, Pierce College, Santa Barbara City College, Santa Rosa Junior College, Shasta College, West Hills College. Local senates interested in obtaining specific policies can contact the Academic Senate Office.*

STRATEGY #1: A PROFESSIONAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE (PRC)

One strategic option utilizes a Professional Relations Committee (PRC) to assist faculty in resolving noncontractual, work-related conflicts or disputes between faculty members. Each of the faculty members of such a committee is expected to have expertise in the areas of counseling and/or mediation and conflict-resolution as a result of professional training; these faculty members are appointed to serve on this committee by the local academic senate.

A PRC's primary function is to provide confidential mediation, conflict-resolution, counseling, or advising as a third party to any faculty member requesting such service. The perceived utility of such a committee is in its support of increased cooperation and professional effectiveness of the parties involved. PRC assistance would not be appropriate when conflicts are department-wide or between institutional subunits or when related to contractual matters within the purview of the collective bargaining unit. In this latter instance, the committee would advise the faculty member requesting services of the committee to contact the appropriate district or union representative.

Faculty wishing to seek assistance through a PRC can call any member of the committee for confidential assistance. If the committee member initially contacted is unavailable, he or she is to refer the petitioning faculty to another member of the committee.

A PRC can offer two types of assistance similar to the following:

1. The requesting faculty member may receive individual counseling/advising of a confidential nature when he/she chooses not to involve the other party to the conflict, or when the other party is unwilling to be involved. The committee serves to assist the faculty member to clarify feelings, issues, and options surrounding the alleged conflict.
2. The requesting faculty member and the other faculty member may volunteer to participate mutually in a confidential conflict-resolution process facilitated by a trained committee member. In performing this role, the facilitator is expected to remain objective and neutral, yet sensitive to the needs and perceptions of the individuals involved. This process aims to increase mutual understanding between the parties and enhance communication; it further targets "win-win" solutions to perceived problems.

Once a request has been made of a PRC, the following steps are typical of the committee's process. While these steps can occur in one meeting, additional meetings may also be necessary to address a complaint fully.

1. The facilitator works with the parties to ensure that each is heard by the other in an attempt to clarify the problem.
2. From this discussion, possible solutions are formulated, identified, and clearly acknowledged by both parties; one or more of these solutions are mutually selected for implementation.
3. The identified solution or solutions are implemented on a trial basis for a period of time agreed upon by both parties.
4. After this period of time has ended, the solution or solutions are evaluated for effectiveness; modifications are made as needed.
5. Other campus/community resources may be used, if necessary. (If these resources include those related to contractual/work related issues, the PRC would cease inquiry into the matter and direct involved faculty to the appropriate agencies.)

STRATEGY #2: LOCAL SENATE OR LOCAL DISTRICT POLICY: COMPLAINT RESOLUTION PROCEDURES

A second strategic option that several local academic senates have adopted to confront unethical or unprofessional faculty behavior includes procedural mechanisms outlined either in local board policy or the local academic senate constitution. In some cases, these mechanisms are included in the local bargaining agreement. Regardless of where such mechanisms are cited, all seem to delineate similar approaches.

Each mechanism reviewed under this general grouping clearly differentiates between complaints or concerns arising in response to actions having adverse effects on faculty with respect to their individual rights "related" and "unrelated" to contractual areas of personal benefits or working conditions; 'related' complaints are to be referred immediately to the respective collective bargaining agent or other appropriate agency. For example, complaints of sexual harassment, which are governed by law, district policy and/or contract, and have specified methods of review and remedy already in place, would be inappropriate complaints for a local academic senate resolution procedure (regardless of where this complaint procedure is registered). "Unrelated" complaints, however, including a faculty member's claim to have been the subject of unjust action or denied rights by another faculty member, are quite appropriate for this form of general complaint resolution procedure.

These types of local academic senate or board policy approaches to dealing with unprofessional or unethical behavior usually provide both a formal and an informal procedural option to resolve the conflict. Particular care should be taken when policies end with a requirement or remedy imposed on a faculty member. In these cases, local senates should consider whether the matter should be negotiated into the collective bargaining agreement in order to ensure that faculty members will have due process.

The **informal resolution process** is typically the option first sought when a perceived injustice has occurred. The initiating faculty member simply attempts to resolve the issue by informal discussion with the person directly involved in the matter prior to any formal complaint being noted or filed. If and when this process does not lead to a mutually acceptable outcome, the formal process may be initiated upon request.

The **formal resolution process** generally seeks to resolve the matter at the lowest possible level employing mediation or administrative referral. Proceedings at all levels, however, are kept confidential and as informal as appropriate. There are several possible levels to the formal process:

1. At what is considered to be "Level One" of such approaches, the complainant will first discuss the perceived injustice with the administrator most immediately connected to the area; the objective is to achieve resolution at this first level. Should this not be achieved, the faculty member may elect to move to the next level to find resolution.
2. The complainant will invoke "Level Two" if he/she is not satisfied with the disposition of the perceived injustice at Level One, or if no written response has been rendered within a specified number of days (usually between 5 and 10 working days) after presentation of the initial complaint. At this point, the faculty member may file a complaint in writing with the local senate president (or designee, for example a counselor professionally trained to assist in such a mediating role) and the appropriate administrator. Within the designated number of days after receipt of the written complaint, the local senate president, or designee, perhaps with the help of the appropriate administrator, when

necessary, will mediate discussion between the individuals involved and will attempt to resolve the perceived complaint.

3. The process may move to "Level Three" if the faculty member is not satisfied with the dispensation of his/her complaint at Level Two, or if no written decision has been rendered within a further specified number of days (usually ranging between 10 and 30 working days) after he/she first met with the local academic senate president and appropriate administrator (if involved). If the process has not satisfied the complainant to this point, the faculty member may submit the issue to a formal hearing committee.

In some cases, the faculty member bringing forth the complaint may pursue a remedy all the way to the local board of trustees, who may render a final determination of the matter.

All documents, communications, and records dealing with such a local complaint resolution procedure are typically filed separately with the local senate for a minimum period of time. This time length varies among procedures, though two years appears to be a recommended minimum. Appropriate bargaining units should be consulted to specify contractually any prohibitions about the use, retention, or access to this body of data.

STRATEGY #3: PROFESSIONAL ETHICS AND STANDARDS COMMITTEE

Another procedural option used in the field is a **Professional Ethics and Standards Committee** (PESC) set up through local academic senates. Under this type of procedure, senates will appoint college faculty from a variety of disciplines who are tenured and well respected on campus to serve as members of this committee.

The PESC option has several objectives: to preserve an environment that encourages the free pursuit of truth, and professional conduct; to support a mutually respectful atmosphere that engenders the optimal scholarly standards of each discipline; and to promote unity within the educational community. To achieve these ends, the committee's charge is to arbitrate conflicts between individual faculty members, clarify facts and mediate disputes between parties. Note here again, that this committee deals only with faculty-to-faculty conflicts whereby there is typically no contractual or bargained procedure to grieve such conflicts.

In fulfilling these responsibilities, the PESC will typically take the following steps:

1. Evaluate circumstances concerning alleged unprofessional conduct;
2. Determine whether or not to meet with the parties involved in an effort toward conciliation and conflict resolution;
3. Determine whether or not to conduct a formal hearing; and finally,
4. Determine whether or not to make a confidential recommendation to a closed personnel session of the local academic senate.

Upon completion of such an investigation, the committee may recommend that one of the following actions be taken:

1. Continue efforts to clarify and discuss the facts with the involved parties in order to modify the behavior considered detrimental to the educational environment;
2. Refer the matter to the district grievance officer, or finally,
3. Refer the matter to the administration.

An archive of all decisions (excluding names) is maintained to enable the campus or district to further clarify or interpret ethical policies or standards.

INSTITUTIONAL CLIMATE: THE AAUP PROCEDURES FOR CENSURE FOR SUBSTANTIAL NONCOMPLIANCE WITH THE PRINCIPLES OF SHARED GOVERNANCE

As noted above, institutional climate and context is key to determining what approach will work best at a given college. And in some cases, recurrent problems stem from, or at least cannot be addressed adequately without consideration of ongoing institutional conflict and/or disregard of established academic norms and practices; these often are at the heart of governance problems.

The Academic Senate has a number of strategies to assist local senates in addressing such larger institutional problems; these include informal strategic advice, campus visits and tailored workshops, and more formal technical assistance jointly provided by the Academic Senate and representatives from the Community College League of California representing college presidents/chancellors and local trustees. Complaints that involve violations of state law or Title 5 Regulations can be directed to the Chancellor's Office for review and adjudication. In addition, the Senate has established an organizational partnership with AAUP; in part, this was done to gain assistance in addressing egregious and recalcitrant problems with governance or academic freedom not resolvable by the other methods.

While the AAUP does not have a procedure to censure the inappropriate behaviors of individual members of an institution, it does have a procedure that attempts to deal with perceived breaches of professional behavior of the collective institution, through an institutional censure process. The Committee on Academic Freedom has established such a censure process:

1. A complaint reaches the AAUP offices from faculty members, usually on that campus.
2. Staff (in consultation with Committee on Academic Freedom) "looks into the matter."
3. If they deem it warranted, they will write letters to:
   a. The administration of the college or university to convey their concerns; and
   b. The charging parties, inviting them to make efforts necessary to prove their contentions.
4. If no resolution occurs at that stage, the committee, with staff, determines if the complaint warrants moving to the formal investigation stage. If so,
   a. A two-person ad hoc committee composed of faculty from other institutions investigates and submits a report to the staff of the Committee on Academic Freedom.
   b. The Committee can authorize publication of the draft text.
   c. If authorized, the draft text is sent confidentially to the institution for comment and correction of factual errors only.
   d. Following any changes deemed necessary by the institutional review, the report is published in the AAUP journal.
   e. Once published, the delegates may vote during their annual meeting for censure.[15]

SUMMARY COMMENTS ON SELECTED STRATEGIES

The strategies outlined above represent a range of possible processes and procedures that respond to–and may actually guide–the ethical and professional behavior of faculty members, but they do not constitute the full range of possible strategies. The Academic Senate solicits other successful strategies currently being practiced and not included above. As stated before, modification of these illustrative examples would likely be necessary to render them appropriate to the particular institutional climate.

---

[15] *For more detail regarding the censure process described above and the AAUP statement on Governance, go to website: http://www.igc.apc.org/aaupgovern.htm.*

RECOMMENDATIONS TO LOCAL SENATES

LOCAL ACADEMIC SENATES SHOULD:

1. Adopt a statement of ethical principles, such as the AAUP statement or the Academic Senate's expanded AAUP statement that reflects the expected professional behavior of faculty.
2. Periodically review and strengthen college policies and practices that foster ethical communities of practice and that support the generation and maintenance of professional excellence, including fair and effective hiring practices, effective and rigorous peer evaluation and tenure review policies, faculty mentoring programs and other support structures.

LOCAL ACADEMIC SENATES MIGHT:

1. Consider inviting a guest speaker or speakers to join in the continuing discourse on the importance of maintaining high professional standards among faculty.
2. Incorporate consideration of ethical dilemmas and professional responsibilities into ongoing professional development programs.
3. Consider adoption of a procedure, responsive to the local climate, to address perceived breaches of ethical responsibilities. In doing so, senates would:
   - Work closely with their bargaining unit and.. with relevant administrators to delineate areas of appropriate authority; and to consider, where appropriate, inclusion in the collective bargaining agreement;
   - Stipulate clear processes for redress and appeal; and,
   - Take extraordinary care not to create a climate that is hostile to academic freedom and faculty creativity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, G. (1997). *Rethinking College Education.* Lawrence: University Press of Kansas

Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (April, 1983). *Academic Standards: The Faculty's Role.*

Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (April, 1987). *Professional Standards for Faculty.*

Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (April, 1988). *Why the Academic Senate has adopted the AAUP Ethics Statement.*

Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (April, 1990). *Accreditation: Evaluating the Collective Faculty.*

Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (April, 1990). *Guidelines for Developing a Faculty Evaluation Process.*

Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (October, 1990). *Tenure: Towards a Model Four-Year Tenure Process.*

Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (October, 1991). *Student Equity: Proposals for Action.*

Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (April, 1994). *Faculty Ethics: The AAUP Ethics Statement.*

Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (April, 1996). *Toward a Nonviolent Campus Climate Conflict Resolution.*

Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (April, 1998). *Academic Freedom and Tenure: A Faculty Perspective.*

Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (October, 2000). *Faculty Development: A Senate Issue.*

American Association of University Professors (revised June, 1987). *Statement of Professional Ethics.* Approved by the Association's Committee on Professional Ethics, adopted by the Association's Council in June 1987, and endorsed by the Seventy-third Annual Meeting.

Grosz, K. S. (1990). "The Challenge of Cultural Diversity in California Community Colleges." *Forum,* v. VII (reprint), Academic Senate for California Community Colleges.

Heslep, R. D. (1997). *Moral Education for Americans.* Westport, CT: Praiger.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

SURVEY: CAMPUS PROFESSIONAL RELATIONS PROCEDURES

College: _____

Your Name: (Optional) _____

E-mail or Phone: _____

This survey asks you to respond to questions concerning three separate kinds of statements:

(1) A statement of faculty ethics;

(2) A statement of faculty code of conduct (that may or may not be based upon a statement of ethics); and

(3) A written set of procedures in the event faculty codes of conduct—articulated or not—are violated.

1. Has your senate adopted a statement of faculty ethics? * (Please circle one answer)

☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ UNSURE

* If you answered YES to Question 1, please answer Part A and Part B;
If NO, please skip to Question 2.

A. Is this adopted statement a restatement of, or a statement based upon: (Please check most appropriate choice)

☐ AAUP statement of ethics

☐ Academic Senate for California Community Colleges' expanded statement on ethics

☐ An original statement written by our own faculty

☐ Something other than those stated above (please list):

☐ Unsurel.

B. Does this statement serve as a basis for a faculty code of conduct?

☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ UNSURE

2. Does your college have a written code of conduct governing faculty members' relationships with:**

Students: ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ UNSURE

Staff: ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ UNSURE

Administrators: ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ UNSURE

Other Faculty: ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ UNSURE

3. Does your college have a set of procedures it implements in the event that faculty members violate an implied or written code of conduct as it applies to:**

Students: ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ UNSURE

Staff: ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ UNSURE

Administrators: ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ UNSURE

Other Faculty: ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ UNSURE

** If you responded YES to any of the categories in Questions 2 or 3, please identify (at the top of the next page) the documents in which such procedures are codified as it applies to the appropriate category.

	Faculty Contract	Local Senate/ Constitution/By-laws	Board Policy	Other	Unsure
Students	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Staff	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Administrators	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other Faculty	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

4. Please check ALL of the following that apply regarding your senate's consideration of a written set of procedures to be implemented in the event faculty violate an implied or written code of conduct.

   ☐ It has not been a topic/issue for our local senate.

   ☐ It has been a topic for senate discussion but no action has been taken to adopt a policy.

   ☐ It has been adopted but not yet implemented.

   ☐ We have adopted a faculty ethics policy with NO procedural component.

5. Please check ALL of the following that apply if your college has not considered/adopted a set of procedures to be invoked in the event of perceived ethical violations on the part of faculty:

   ☐ We didn't consider it a senate responsibility.

   ☐ We thought it a contractual matter.

   ☐ We didn't see a need for it on our campus at this time.

   ☐ We thought it too politically charged.

   ☐ We were concerned about potential legal liability.

   ☐ We couldn't agree on a mechanism.

   ☐ Enforcement mechanisms seemed unlikely or unable to produce hoped for results.

   ☐ Other:

If you have indicated that your college has written statements of ethics, codes of conduct, or written procedures, please indicate whom we might contact on your campus to secure copies for our further inquiry:

Name: _____

Position: _____

E-mail or Phone, if known: _____

Thank you for taking the time to complete this important survey!

APPENDIX B

ETHICS: WHY THE ACADEMIC SENATE HAS ADOPTED THE AAUP ETHICS STATEMENT

April 1988

Educational Policies Committee 1987-88
Carmen Maldonado Decker, Chair, Cypress College
Karen Sue Grosz, President, Academic Senate for California Community Colleges
Michael Anker, Contra Costa College
Erna Noble, Chaffey College
Sue Britton, Cypress College
Susan Petit, College of San Mateo
Lynda Corbin, San Diego Mesa College
Robert Turley, San Bernardino Valley College
Randal Lawson, Santa Monica College
Maryamber Villa, Los Angeles Valley College

Ethics in teaching is much discussed, but unfortunately both faculty and the general public often seem more concerned with what is unethical than with ethics as a code of moral values. The 1987 "Statement on Professional Ethics" of the American Association of University Professors is an exception to this concern with unethical conduct, for it sets forth five ethical obligations of faculty: as members of a discipline, as teachers, as colleagues, as members of institutions, and as members of a community. **The Educational Policies Committee has adopted this statement with only minor editorial changes, for the reasons which follow**. (The edited statement can be found at the end of the paper.

I. The AAUP statement begins with the faculty's duty to their disciplines. That obligation is not greater than the others—in fact, each of the five areas covered is broader than the last. But for most of us, it was through our academic disciplines that we first became truly involved in education. Our disciplines reflect not only our major intellectual interests but a commitment to disinterested inquiry, to truth, and to thought. We show this commitment mainly through our knowledgeable and enthusiastic teaching or through our work as counselors, librarians, and nurses.

   But we cannot remain knowledgeable—and probably we cannot remain enthusiastic—without also performing activities which keep us current, and so we have an obligation to read the recent literature, attend conferences, belong to professional organizations, take courses, and engage in other staff development activities. We may even be able to carry out original research in our fields or otherwise to practice our disciplines. We must take advantage of sabbaticals, leaves, exchange programs, and other staff development activities, and we must also seek to create such opportunities.

II. The AAUP next discusses the faculty member's obligation to teach. In the community colleges, we have a special obligation not only to teach our subject matters but also to instill a respect for truth and intellectual inquiry. We often must also raise our students' intellectual ambitions and combat defeatism on the part of students who feel that they cannot succeed because of their race, social status, or previous educational experience.

Treating students ethically means not only avoiding favoritism or exploitation, but also giving students the education that they deserve. We must not compromise course standards, and we must provide, individually and collectively, the means for success. Individually, we must offer enough out-of-class time to students, and we often must insist that they take advantage of it; collectively, we must provide adequate testing, counseling, placement, learning resources, and job and transfer information. We do our students no favor if we let them pass without the skills and knowledge they need, and we hurt them equally if we do not provide them with adequate support services.

III. Community college faculty's obligations to their colleagues are important, too, as the recent Master Plan Commission recommendations emphasize. We have not always had full responsibilities in hiring and firing, meaningful evaluation, and retention and promotion, but that situation is changing. Interestingly, we have often fulfilled the obligation to our colleagues in a way the AAUP does not mention, by sharing information, offering disinterested advice, and team teaching. A part of our ethics is helping each other get through difficult times and sharing our successes.

Our obligations to our colleagues also include, according to the AAUP statement, a duty to participate in governance. For us, that generally means serving on committees which recommend policies and make decisions relating to students, courses, and professional leaves. Under new Title 5 regulations, or under the provisions of legislation now being considered in Sacramento, those duties will surely be expanded.

IV. After considering the obligation to colleagues, the AAUP discusses the obligation to the institution. The AAUP statement stresses the fact that faculty may serve an institution by criticizing it, even though they are legally obliged to follow the institution's rules. When we recommend changes, we should be trying to improve the institution; if we merely accept poor conditions because we are afraid to criticize, we are failing in our duty as faculty members.

This same obligation to our institution requires that we give it an adequate amount of time. We must meet classes, keep office hours, and serve on committees. Our institutions have the reciprocal obligations not to overload our classes, and to create full-time positions so that faculty are paid in proportion to the work required.

V. The last obligation discussed in the AAUP statement is to the community. In carrying it out, we should not scant our professional duties or abuse our connection with an institution of higher learning, but we must be as diligent in serving our community as any of its members. We offer special services to the community through speakers' bureaus and other college-sponsored activities; we vote and encourage our students to do so; we participate in political activities; we obey the laws or perhaps participate in open civil disobedience against them; we work for and contribute to fund-raising drives; we serve in secular and religious institutions which reflect our beliefs.

An ethics statement should spur us to be our best. In adopting the ethics statement of the American Association of University Professors, we not only have aligned ourselves more fully with our colleagues at senior institutions but also have accepted and endorsed a policy that is a source of pride and inspiration.

1987 AAUP STATEMENT ON PROFESSIONAL ETHICS

I. Community college faculty members, guided by a deep conviction of the worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge, recognize the special responsibilities placed upon them. Their primary responsibility to their subjects is to seek and to state the truth as they see it. To this end faculty members devote their energies to developing and improving their scholarly competence. They accept the obligation to exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge. They practice intellectual honesty. Although faculty members may follow subsidiary interests, these interests must never seriously hamper or compromise their freedom of inquiry.

II. As teachers, faculty members encourage the free pursuit of learning in their students. They hold before them the best scholarly standards of their discipline. Faculty members demonstrate respect for the student as an individual, and adhere to their proper role as intellectual guides and counselors. Faculty members make every able effort to foster honest academic conduct and to assure that evaluation of students reflects their true merit. They respect the confidential nature of the relationship between faculty member and student. They avoid any exploitation of students for private advantage and acknowledge significant assistance from them. They protect the academic freedom of students.

III. As colleagues, faculty members have obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. Faculty members do not discriminate against or harass colleagues. They respect and defend the free inquiry of associates. In the exchange of criticism and ideas faculty members show due respect for the opinions of others. Faculty members acknowledge their academic debts and strive to be objective in their professional judgment of colleagues. Faculty members accept their share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of their institution.

IV. As members of an academic institution, faculty members seek above all to be effective teachers and scholars. Although faculty members observe the stated regulations of their institutions, provided the regulations do not contravene academic freedom, they maintain their right to criticize and seek revision. Faculty members give due regard to their paramount responsibilities within their institution in determining the amount and character of work done outside it. When considering the interruption or termination of their service, faculty members recognize the effect of their decisions upon the program of the institution and give due notice of their intentions.

V. As members of their community, faculty members have the rights and obligations of all citizens. Faculty members measure the urgency of these obligations in the light of their responsibilities to their subject areas, to their students, to their profession, and to their institutions. When they speak or act as private persons they avoid creating the impression that they speak or act for their colleges or universities. As citizens engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and integrity, faculty members have a particular obligation to promote conditions of free inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom.

APPENDIX C

FACULTY ETHICS: EXPANDING THE AAUP ETHICS STATEMENT

April 1994

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

Received April 1994

I. INTRODUCTION

The Academic Senate For California Community Colleges adopted the "American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Ethics Statement" in 1987 and in April 1988 released a paper entitled, *"Why The Academic Senate Has Adopted The AAUP Ethics Statement."* The AAUP statement and explanation for its adoption have been quite helpful to local senates in discussions of ethics. However, community college faculty face situations which are distinctly different from those faced by university professors. Furthermore, since the time the ethics statement was adopted by the Academic Senate, AB 1725 has become law, and the bill's redefinition of the community college faculty profession has resulted in an abundance of ethical questions regarding faculty roles, responsibilities, and obligations. Hence, the purpose of this paper is to offer expanded discussions on the AAUP Ethics Statement focusing on issues which typically face faculty in California's Community Colleges.

The AAUP ethics document consists of five statements outlining faculty responsibilities to their disciplines, students, colleagues, institutions, and communities. The text of these statements is included in Section II. of this paper. They serve as an excellent foundation in principles upon which decisions of ethical behavior can be based.

This paper expands those principles in the areas of scholarly competence, honest academic conduct of students, academic standards, cultural and gender sensitivity, the free pursuit of learning, avoiding exploitation of students, academic freedom, and contributing to the profession.

II. AAUP ETHICS STATEMENT

Professors, guided by a deep conviction of the worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge, recognize the special responsibilities placed upon

them. Their primary responsibility to their subject is to seek and to state the truth as they see it. To this end professors devote their energies to developing and improving their scholarly competence. They accept the obligation to exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge. They practice intellectual honesty. Although professors may follow subsidiary interests, these interests must never seriously hamper or compromise their freedom of inquiry.

As teachers, professors encourage the free pursuit of learning in their students. They hold before them the best scholarly and ethical standards of their discipline. Professors demonstrate respect for students as individuals and adhere to their proper roles as intellectual guides and counselors. Professors make every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to ensure that their evaluations of students reflect each student's true merit. They respect the confidential nature of the relationship between professor and student. They avoid any exploitation, harassment, or discriminatory treatment of students. They acknowledge significant academic or scholarly assistance from them. They protect their academic freedom.

As colleagues, professors have obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. Professors do not discriminate against or harass colleagues. They respect and defend the free inquiry of associates. In the exchange of criticism and ideas professors show due respect for the opinions of others. Professors acknowledge academic debt and strive to be objective in their professional judgment of colleagues. Professors accept their share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of their institution.

As members of an academic institution, professors seek above all to be effective teachers and scholars. Although professors observe the stated regulations of the institution, provided the regulations do not contravene academic freedom, they maintain their right to criticize and seek revision. Professors give due regard to their paramount responsibilities within their institutions in determining the amount and character of work done outside it. When considering the interruption or termination of their service, professors recognize the effect of their decision upon the program of the institution and give due notice of their intentions.

As members of their community, professors have the rights and obligations of other citizens. Professors measure the urgency of these obligations in the light of their responsibilities to their subject, to their students, to their profession, and to their institution. When they speak or act as private persons, they avoid creating the impression of speaking or acting for their college or university. As citizens engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and integrity, professors have a particular obligation to promote conditions of free inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom.

III. EXPANDING THE AAUP ETHICS STATEMENT

References in the following sections raise questions about how faculty interact with all members of the college community in carrying out their professional responsibilities and statements specific to students or colleagues should be interpreted as applying to other individuals.

A. DEVELOPING SCHOLARLY COMPETENCE

Every discipline requires scholarship. Just as doctors are obligated to keep abreast of new developments in medicine and attorneys are required to know evolving laws, faculty must keep up with new developments in their disciplines and in teaching methods. It is a faculty member's obligation to pursue professional and academic development enabling them to infuse appropriate changes in curriculum as necessary.

In addition, faculty have academic freedom to pursue the truth. The intellectual virtues of being open-minded, fair, honest and objective in the consideration of differing views, being thorough in research, avoiding the manipulation of data, reaching a well-reasoned viewpoint and the like, should all be fostered within the intellectual character of the faculty member.

These attitudes toward learning are precisely what faculty are trying to get their students to acquire, therefore, faculty are obligated to teach and lead by example. Modeling and teaching critical thinking and attempting to instill in students intellectual virtues which foster critical thinking is a key responsibility for faculty.

In other words, modeling a democratic style rather than an authoritarian one is more appropriate. Instead of trying to control the beliefs, opinions and values of our students, encouraging pluralistic dialogue is an ethical necessity. Teaching students, by the example of our classes, to respect differing views and how to benefit from the wisdom often found in ideas with which one disagrees can provide a profound learning experience for students.

B. MAINTAINING HONEST ACADEMIC CONDUCT

Faculty have an obligation to ensure that students do their own work, that is, to prevent academic dishonesty. Types of dishonesty include copying from others, turning in work that is not the student's own, and using references without appropriate citation. Faculty must provide a definition of acceptable academic conduct on the first day of class through discussion and in writing. Furthermore, setting up testing situations that minimize the potential for misconduct is an essential strategy for preventing academic dishonesty.

Colleges should have a policy on honest academic conduct developed by the Academic Senate. Faculty are obliged to make sure that such policies exist, are published, and provide appropriate due process standards. In addition, faculty need to openly express a zero tolerance policy toward academic dishonesty. Students who behave dishonestly should face retributive consequences consistent with the institution's policies.

Finally, there are rules and expectations of proper academic behavior that should be articulated and taught within the framework of the respective academic disciplines. Respect for students requires that all be held to the same standards of conduct. Holding students to different standards is demeaning and insulting.

C. INSURING CULTURAL AND GENDER SENSITIVITY: RESPECTING STUDENTS AS INDIVIDUALS

Respecting students as individuals is an ethical imperative for faculty. All students, as individuals deserve the respect of faculty regardless of their cultural background, ethnicity, race, gender, religious beliefs, political ideologies, disability, sexual preference, age, or socioeconomic status.

One of the challenges of being an educator is to reach our students at their current point of understanding. When relating to students as individuals, faculty must recognize the unique circumstances of each student's life. In particular, some students may possess learning styles which hinder them from benefiting from traditional methods of instruction. Faculty have the responsibility to use all possible effective pedagogical tools to reach those students.

Students look to faculty as role models. Not only must faculty exhibit an appreciation and respect for students from all backgrounds, but it is also imperative that they teach and model behavior which is tolerant and shows appreciation and respect for others within their respective disciplines. Affirming individual students' abilities, strengthening their self identities, and assisting them to reach their full potential is a model worth emulating.

D. ENCOURAGING THE FREE PURSUIT OF LEARNING: SECURING STUDENT ACCESS AND SUCCESS

The concept of a community college as defined by the California Community Colleges' Master Plan is one of the best examples of an egalitarian educational system of higher education in the world. One could say that the idea of open access is the quintessential expression of democracy in education and that open access exemplifies the free pursuit of learning.

As participants in the development of educational policies at our institutions we must remain diligent to protect students' right to freely pursue their

education, watching closely to prevent barriers to access, particularly to those from historically under-represented groups. These barriers may include restrictive or difficult to accomplish admission procedures, lack of access to counseling, unjustified prerequisites, and in other ways. Faculty may incorrectly assume that references, examples, or methodologies they use are part of the students' experience or cultural heritage. Methods should be sought which can make learning more achievable to students. Faculty have an ethical responsibility as educators to reduce as much as possible all barriers to the pursuit of education and to seek new methods to assure our students' success.

E. CREATING A LEARNING ENVIRONMENT OF TRUST AND SENSITIVITY

Exploitation of students by faculty members can take many guises. Be it for personal financial gain, sexual gratification, or any other reason, such exploitation is to be avoided at all costs. It is a fundamental ethical principle that individuals in power and authority should not use their advantaged position for their own gain or to advance their own self-interest. In light of the fact that the educational profession is one in which trust between faculty member and student best maximizes the results of the learning experience, it is especially reprehensible for faculty to use their power and authority for such self-gratification.

Faculty are in a power position and as such there is no greater violation of authority and power in higher education than when a faculty member exploits the power of this relationship with students. Students may have fears and insecurities about their abilities and what the future holds for them. They may tend to view faculty with a sense of awe that is based on a projected expectation rather than personal experience of proved expertise or trustworthiness. They tend to trust faculty beyond areas of academic expertise. To take advantage of individuals under these conditions is ethically inexcusable.

For example, in cases where some students are being evaluated on the basis of academic standards while others are being evaluated on the basis of responsiveness to inappropriate advances or where personal services or favors are traded for grades, privilege or recognition, one can easily see that such behavior is a violation of ethics. Students must be evaluated solely on the basis of academic standards.

Faculty must be cognizant of the possible perceptions and interpretations their students may formulate in response to faculty-student interactions. Therefore, the faculty member is obligated to create a learning environment free of insensitivity, hostility, and coercion. Faculty must realize that such an environment often can be more contingent upon the perceptions of students than on the intentions of faculty.

F. ESTABLISHING ACADEMIC STANDARDS

California Community Colleges have the dual mission of preparing individuals for work and citizenship. Successful careers depend on acquiring the skills, knowledge and abilities to perform competently in the work place. So, to prepare students for the world of work and to avoid misleading them as to what they can expect once they leave the campus, it is important to evaluate students in a manner which is consistent with the academic standards of the discipline.

Academic standards should be determined in the context of one's academic discipline by the community of scholars within the discipline. They should not differ significantly from one faculty member to another within the same discipline teaching the same or similar course(s). If, for example, there is significant variation in grading criteria and standards among faculty who teach courses that are prerequisites for courses further in a sequence, then clearly students, subsequent courses, and the disciplines, are harmed.

Additionally, the mastery that faculty have of their own discipline and scholarship entitles them to their classroom and the freedom of the presentation of

their subject matter. However, it is unethical for a faculty member to persistently interject material unrelated to the course such that the instructor fails to offer the agreed upon subject matter of the course.

G. MAINTAINING ACADEMIC FREEDOM

By nature and definition, a college campus embraces the value of academic freedom. In order to pursue truth, survey the marketplace of ideas, and acquire knowledge and understanding, both faculty and students must have the freedom to express their views and be safe from reprisals. However, there are obligations which accompany academic freedom.

The first obligation in maintaining academic freedom is to create a learning environment in the classroom which fosters the free exchange of ideas. In other words, we should encourage the expression of diverse views and the understanding of those views. For example, if the instructor of a philosophy class only permitted the view of atheism to be expressed and did not allow the counter view of theism to be expressed, or the contrary, that instructor would be undermining academic freedom.

The second obligation which is required to maintain academic freedom is to clearly distinguish when one is speaking for oneself and when one is speaking as a representative of the educational institution. The classroom **in particular** should not be used as a forum for the advancement of personal causes. Our obligation is to inform, not to indoctrinate. If a stormy political issue arises, we can certainly encourage a lively discussion of all facets of the situation. However, we cannot present just our view or advocate only our own position unless we do so in the context of debate or other such pedagogical structures where opposing views may be presented.

IV. CONCLUSION

Being a faculty member means being a colleague in a profession which involves participating in a profession where freedom of expression is of paramount importance to ensure the open exchange of ideas. Faculty are self-directed and, to a certain extent, determine the nature and quantity of their workload. Since tenured faculty have job security, the potential for individual tenured faculty having a less than conscientious work ethic is a possibility. It is important for faculty to maintain and strengthen standards of professionalism. A recommendation on a framework and processes for developing local faculty professional expectations and accountability processes is currently under consideration by the Academic Senate's Educational Policies Committee.

Academic Senate for California Community Colleges
428 J Street, Suite 430, Sacramento, CA 95814
916/445.4753 http://www.academicsenate.cc.ca.us

Academic Senate for California Community Colleges
428 J Street, Suite 430, Sacramento, CA 95814
916/445.4753 http://www.academicsenate.cc.ca.us

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

X	This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.
	This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").